

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 over Reuben

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Reuben et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,467,385 ("Reuben"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-5 and 11-15 recite, *inter alia*, a processor adapted to **selectively store** Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone. Claims 21-24, 26 and 28 recite, *inter alia*, making a **selective** Caller ID storage decision based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

Reuben appears to teach a calling number display and recording system that stores caller identification (CID) information (Abstract). A caller's telephone number and other information is recorded when a called party is not present (Reuben, Abstract). When a user's telephone or answering machine answers a call by going off-hook, the telephone carrier voltage drops to about +5 volts d.c. (Reuben, col. 6, lines 29-32). CID information is detected, captured in SRAM, displayed and saved for later use by the actions of a CID recorder (Reuben, col. 6, lines 38-41; col. 9, lines 4-10; col. 10, lines 35-44).

Reuben discloses for calls where CID information is available, the CID information is always stored in SRAM. Reuben fails to make any decisions based on an off-hook condition. **Always** storing CID information is **NOT selective** storage of Caller ID data, much less **selective storage** of Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone, as respectively claimed by claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28.

A benefit of having selective storage of Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone is, e.g., optimizing use of a limited storage space. Conventionally, telephones with CID capability have limited storage capacity. Conventionally, all CID data is stored upon receipt for later review by a telephone's user. Making selective storage of Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone allows only storage of Caller ID data for those calls

missed, i.e., the telephone remains in an on-hook condition. Only storing Caller ID data for calls missed reduces the amount of data in a limited storage space thereby optimizing the use of the storage space. This benefit can not be accomplished with Reuben.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 16 and 27 over Reuben in view of Hirai

In the Office Action, claims 6, 16 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Reuben in view of Hirai, U.S. Patent No. 5,446,785 ("Hirai"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6, 16 and 27 are dependent on claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11 and 21.

Claims 6 and 16 recite, *inter alia*, a processor adapted to selectively store Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone. Claim 27 recites, *inter alia*, making a selective Caller ID storage decision based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

As discussed above, Reuben fails to teach selective storage of Caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 6, 16 and 27.

The Office Action relies on Hirai to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Reuben to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hirai appears to disclose a telephone terminal equipment that detects caller ID information, stores the caller ID information and displays the caller ID information on a liquid crystal display (col. 11, lines 54-64). The caller ID information is stored for each incoming call (Hirai, col. 13, lines 32-38).

Hirai discloses caller ID information is stored for each incoming call. Hirai fails to teach selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 6, 16 and 27.

Neither Reuben nor Hirai, either alone or in combination, disclose teach or suggest selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 6, 16 and 27.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6, 16 and 27 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 over Reuben in view of Lim

In the Office Action, claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Reuben in view of Lim et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,883,942 ("Lim"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 are dependent on claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11 and 21.

Claims 7-10 and 17-20 recite, *inter alia*, a processor adapted to selectively store Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone. Claims 25 and 29-34 recite, *inter alia*, making a selective Caller ID storage decision based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

As discussed above, Reuben fails to teach selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34.

The Office Action relies on Lim to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Reuben to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lim appears to disclose a caller-ID device and/or an integrated caller ID and answering machine device which is configurable (Abstract). When the caller ID device receives an incoming call, it shows caller ID information for an incoming call on a display unit (Lim, col. 6, lines 14-17). At the same time, the caller ID device stores the caller ID information of the incoming call in a caller ID memory area of a data storage unit for later access and review by a user (Lim, col. 6, lines 20-23).

Lim discloses caller ID information is stored for each incoming call. Lim fails to teach selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34.

Neither Reuben nor Lim, either alone or in combination, disclose teach or suggest selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df